

The Hidden Cost of Quantum Teleportation and Remote State Preparation

R. Srikanth

Indian Institute of Astrophysics, Koramangala, Bangalore- 34, India

The amount of information transferred during standard quantum teleportation or remote state preparation is equal to the preparation information of the transmitted state, rather than the classical communication required by respective protocol. This is shown by noting that the information required to specify the operation that verifies the transmitted state is identical to the preparation information, at the given level of precision m (in bits). Depending on the resolution of the projective Hilbert space, the preparation information can be made arbitrarily precise and hence indefinitely larger than the classical communication cost. Therefore, the classical communication is insufficient to account for the transfer of preparation information, which is then attributed to the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channel. Some fundamental repercussions for relativistic quantum information processing are briefly discussed.

Quantum information differs from the classical information in respect of information storage and retrieval. Classically, the information (in bits) extractable from a system through measurement is identical to that needed to prepare/specify one of its microstates. On the other hand, the maximum information that a quantum system can yield is the von Neumann information, $S(\rho) = -\text{tr}(\rho \log \rho)$, which is 1 bit for a qubit, in the state $\rho = \hat{I}/2$. It never exceeds the preparation information, which determines the precision with which the preparatory operation must be applied to a qubit in a reference state to produce a given state vector. This property of quantum information is connected to the unpredictability of measurements, indistinguishability of non-orthogonal states and unclonability of unknown quantum states in quantum mechanics (QM) [1].

The amount of information required to specify an arbitrary state vector is clearly infinite. For our discussion, we begin by considering qubit states at a finite precision of specification. The chosen precision m (bits per amplitude) of the prepared state depends on how much we want to resolve the qubit's Hilbert space. In the geometric formulation of the Hilbert space [2,3], the minimum separation between two microstates (i.e, state vectors) is given by $\phi = 2^{-m/2}$, where ϕ is the smallest resolvable Hilbert space angle, a measure of distance given by the Fubini-Study metric, a Riemannian metric defined on projective Hilbert space [4]. For a qubit specified at $m = 2$ bytes precision, state resolution is a "sphere" of size $2^{-m}\pi \simeq 4.8 \times 10^{-5}$ radians. For a uniform ensemble of all resolvable state vectors $|j\rangle$, each with probability p_j , on average:

$$H(\tilde{p}) \equiv - \sum_j p_j \log p_j = (D - 1)m \text{ bits}, \quad (1)$$

where D is the Hilbert space dimension, is the preparation information required to construct an arbitrary $|j\rangle$. For the m bits required to specify a qubit state vector [5], $m/2$ bits specify the real, and $m/2$ bits, the imaginary part of the amplitude. In general, $H(\tilde{p}) \geq S(\rho)$ because $S(\rho)$ measures entropy with basis states as the statistical alternatives, whereas $H(\tilde{p})$ measures entropy with all resolvable state vectors as the alternatives. Therefore, $H(\tilde{p}) = S(\rho)$ when the ensemble consists only of orthogonal states.

From the viewpoint of information processing, standard quantum teleportation (QT) [6] and remote state preparation (RSP) [7] are remarkable predictions of quantum mechanics, in that they enable the reconstruction of an arbitrary quantum state at the cost of only 2 bits or possibly less (in the case of RSP) of classical communication. QT has been experimentally observed [8]. Even though there is room for improving the reliability of existing experimental realizations of QT [9], its in-principle feasibility is sufficient for our discussion. For studying the information transfer in QT, state representation in terms of density operators is not advantageous. It doesn't distinguish between an *epistemic* (based on what is known) and *ontic* (based on what actually is, if applicable) state. If the transmitted state is unknown both to the sender (called Alice) and receiver (called Bob), then—epistemically—Bob's state remains the same throughout the QT. Just before the start of the QT of an unknown (to Alice and Bob) state $|\psi\rangle$, the reduced density operator, $\text{tr}_A(|\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-|)$, of Bob's entangled particle is $\hat{I}/2$, where $|\Psi^-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle)$. Bob's density operator retains this value just after Alice's Bell state measurement, but before her classical communication (as expected on basis of the no-signaling argument [10]) and also after her classical communication. Thus, from the epistemic viewpoint, represented by Alice and Bob, QT has not altered the state of Bob's qubit, and no information has passed from Alice to Bob's qubit. In fact, this is related to the fact that in quantum information probabilities arising from classical ignorance get mixed up with "useless" information arising purely from quantum indeterminacy.

To better visualize the information budget involved in QT, we can introduce the ontic viewpoint through a third party, called Charlie. Alice and Bob share an indefinitely large store of entangled pairs in the state $|\Psi^-\rangle$. All three

parties agree upon a pre-arranged reference state, say $|\text{ref}\rangle$. Charlie prepares a pure ensemble of qubits with precision m bits and gives it to Alice, who teleports it to Bob.

From the viewpoint of quantifying information transfer, RSP is equivalent to the ontic aspect of QT. Both protocols have the same goal, namely to teleport a quantum state from Alice to Bob consuming, in the simplest instance, one ebit (one pair of maximally entangled qubits) of entanglement. The difference is that in RSP, Alice transmits to Bob a *known* (to her) quantum state at a classical communication cost possibly lesser than that required for QT [11,12]. Therefore, the epistemological duality in discussing quantum teleportation, and the concomittant need for Charlie to serve as Alice's ontic foil, is absent in RSP. In the context of remote state transmission, RSP permits us to exclude the epistemologically somewhat elusive *unknown* quantum state from our discussion. Although we use RSP for the following discussion, we wish to point out that one may equivalently use QT, but in this case, replacing Alice by Charlie as the person who has complete (upto given precision) classical knowledge of the transmitted state.

For the preparation of the pure state, Alice either unitarily evolves $|\text{ref}\rangle$ with a suitable designer Hamiltonian or selectively measures a suitable observable on $|\text{ref}\rangle$. It is assumed that Alice's transmission of the prepared state to Bob is somehow of maximum fidelity.

If the teleported pure ensemble is sufficiently large, Bob can estimate probabilities p_j of eigenstates as the observed frequency f_j . For large sample size N , the normal probability distribution for the frequencies is given by $\sqrt{N/2\pi p_j} \exp[(-N/2)(f_j - p_j)^2/p_j]$. He then confirms with Alice that the estimated p_j 's agree with the state Alice prepared. For high precision preparation, this can be prohibitively costly. A better alternative is that Alice classically communicates her m bits of preparation information to Bob so that the latter might *verify* the teleportation. We define verifiable information as the information specifying, at m -bit precision level, the measurement on a qubit that is guaranteed to produce some predetermined outcome with a success probability $P_s > 1 - 2^{-m}$. This limit is obtained by considering the overlap for the smallest resolvable state separation in the projective Hilbert space of a qubit, and Taylor expanding upto second order.

For example, suppose Bob knows Alice to have prepared the teleported state by rotation about the y -axis. Bob can check whether it is in the state $|\eta\rangle = \alpha|\uparrow\rangle + \beta|\downarrow\rangle$, where α, β are real and satisfy $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1$, by measuring the operator:

$$\hat{M}(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & -\cos \theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where $\theta = 2 \cos^{-1} \alpha$ and ascertaining that $\hat{M}(\theta) = +1$. Equivalently, Bob rotates the teleported state through $-\theta$, and measures $\hat{M}(0)$, to ascertain that the outcome is $+1$. (Alternatively, Bob sends his qubits to Alice, who performs the tests). For example, at two byte precision, Alice can set $\theta = 44.8881^\circ$ and classically communicate this value or α to Bob. To see that all the m bits are significant to the teleportation, let's suppose the last n bits in the preparation information are ignored during verification. The resulting resolution of Hilbert space is coarser by a factor $2^{n/2}$ and the probability of verification falls to $P_s > 1 - 2^{-(m-n)}$. Thus, the number of measurements that don't verify the prepared state increases by a factor 2^n .

Because Bob can verify the transmission to the given accuracy, Alice and Bob know that RSP indeed transfers the m bits of preparation information. Since only 2 bits (in general, $2S(\rho)$ bits) per state are communicated classically in QT and possibly even less in RSP, the classical channel is clearly insufficient to account for the transfer of the preparation information. Hence, the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) channel is invoked to account for the complete information transfer. One might suppose that the information transmitted via the EPR channel is on average $m \pm c$ bits per run, where c is the asymptotic classical communication cost for QT or RSP.

In case of $m - c$, the remaining c bits would be furnished by the classical communication. In fact, if $m = c$ then no information transfer would be required via the EPR channel, which would then serve simply as a sort of subtle reference state provider. Yet, from the viewpoint of state preparation, it would imply that ensembles composed from no more than 2^c distinct state vectors can exist, contrary to our experience. In case of $m + c$, the redundant c bits would be identified by the classical communication. In fact, neither case is true since the classical communication is not precision information. Alice knows that its inclusion or exclusion does not change the resolution of the teleported state in comparison with the prepared state. In the QT version, Charlie knows that the teleported state may not be an exact copy of the prepared state but rotated through an angle known to him on basis of Alice's measurement outcome. The counter-rotations Bob subsequently performs using Charlie's classical communication do not affect the precision of the prepared state.

The classical communication serves only to reset the possibly rotationally scrambled preparation information. The (possibly scrambled) preparation information transmitted through the EPR channel is the hidden cost for QT or RSP, by which quantum entanglement subsidizes remote state transmission. Bob's local cost to implement QT or RSP is only c bits (ignoring the cost of producing the $|\Psi^-\rangle$ state). Alice's cost of transferring the state is also c bits of

classical communication. The true cost of QT— that of transferring the preparation information— is borne by quantum entanglement and hidden from Alice’s and Bob’s view.

The m bits of quantum information are also sufficient as the nonlocal augmentation (i.e, the information in bits about Alice’s detector’s setting given to Bob before his measurement) required to simulate *any* aspect of quantum statistics via a local realistic model of QM. However, interestingly, it turns out that specific non-classical manifestations, such as the cosine correlation appearing in Bell inequalities [13], can be simulated using realistic models with finite bit nonlocality, independent of the resolution of the underlying Hilbert space [14,15].

The transferred information is exponentially larger when we consider the QT of continuous variables [16]. Let $\mathcal{V}_\phi$ be the phase space accessible to the particle. The number $\mathcal{N}$ of phase space cells available to the particle is given by $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{V}_\phi/\hbar^3$. Unlike the classical situation, the quantum object can exist potentially in a superposition of these phase space cell locations. The $\mathcal{N}$ cells are the basis states, requiring $(\mathcal{N}-1)m$ bits of preparation information.

Bell inequalities imply that no local-realistic theory can reproduce quantum statistics. For a non-realistic (in the EPR [17] sense) theory like standard quantum mechanics, it apparently does not forbid a local character. However, this would be at variance with the observation that in QT or RSP information is transmitted through the EPR channel ‘instantaneously’ as Alice performs her joint measurement. What this means is easily seen from Charlie’s viewpoint in a QT protocol, or from Alice’s in an RSP protocol. Let’s consider the latter. It is assumed that Alice and Bob share an ebit of entanglement, and that she proposes to transmit to him a known qubit state $|\eta\rangle$ lying on the equator of the Bloch sphere. Bob is far away, perhaps lightyears away! From the standpoint of the standard formalism of QM, Alice knows that just before her measurement in the basis $(\eta, \eta^\perp)$, Bob’s particle is given by the entangled state vector $|\Psi^-\rangle$. Just after her measurement, she knows Bob’s state vector is the disentangled state $\hat{\sigma}_z|\eta\rangle$ or $|\eta\rangle$ [7]. She concludes that the verifiable quantum preparation information ($\geq m$ bits) required to disentangle Bob’s qubit was transmitted in some sense instantaneously to Bob. QT/RSP may be said to impose a stronger restriction on models reproducing quantum predictions than does the violation of Bell inequalities, because no assumption about realism is needed for them.

The four-way uncertainty in the value of the quantum information transferred in QT, and the corresponding need for classical communication in RSP, are sufficient to anchor to relativistic causality the total information flow from Alice’s to Bob’s system [18]. However, this still leaves open the question of how to covariantly characterize in a special relativistic setting the “instantaneity” of the quantum information flow in QT and RSP [19].

An interesting question is whether there is an upper bound to m due to finite resolution of Hilbert space [15]. One can speculate the existence of a natural finite fine-graining of Hilbert space in analogy with classical phase space. Accordingly, this sets the lower bound to the capacity of the EPR channel. However, the existence or non-existence of such a bound does not affect the present discussion.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am thankful to Ms Mangala Sharma for useful discussions.

-
- [1] C. M. Caves and C. A. Fuchs in *The Dilemma of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen- 60 Years Later (An International Symposium in Honour of Nathan Rosen in Haifa, Israel, March 1995)* eds. A. Mann and M. Revzen, Ann. Israel Phys. Soc. **22** 226 (1996); LANL eprint quant-ph/9601025.
 - [2] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 357 (1981);
 - [3] S. L. Braunstein and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3439 (1994).
 - [4] R. Schack, G. M. D’Ariano and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. E **50**, 972 (1994);
 - [5] The term *qubyte* is convenient to denote the memory allocation needed to specify a qubit’s state— coined by an etymologically erroneous, but convenient, analogy. The value of the bit-size m of a qubyte is unknown, but perhaps finite.
 - [6] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Josza, A. Peres and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993).
 - [7] Charles H. Bennett, David P. DiVincenzo, Peter W. Shor, John A. Smolin, Barbara M. Terhal, William K. Wootters, LANL eprint quant-ph/0006044.
 - [8] D. Bouwmeester, J. -W. Pan, K. Mattle, E. Eibl, H. Weinfurter and A. Zeilinger, Nature **390**, 575 (1997); D. Boschi, S. Branca, F. DeMartini, L. Hardy and S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1121 (1998).
 - [9] L. Vaidman and N. Yoram, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 116 (1999).

- [10] A. Shimony, in *Philosophical Consequences of Quantum Theory*, edited by J. T. Cushing, and E. McMullin (Univ. of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1989).
- [11] A. K. Pati, LANL eprint quant-ph/9901022.
- [12] Hoi-Kwong Lo, LANL eprint quant-ph/9912009.
- [13] J. S. Bell, *Physics* **1** 195 (1964); J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and A. Holt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969).
- [14] G. Brassard, R. Cleve and A. Tapp, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** 1874 (1999); LANL eprint quant-ph/9901035.
- [15] M. Steiner, *Phys. Lett. A* **270** 239 (2000); LANL eprint quant-ph/9902014.
- [16] L. Vaidman, *Phys. Rev. A* **49**, 1473 (1994); S. Braunstein and J. Kimble, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 869 (1998).
- [17] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen, *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777 (1935).
- [18] With a turn of metaphor, one might say that the fragile raft called Peaceful Coexistence [10], tossed violently upon the voluminous stream of quantum information, is anchored by a relatively thin 2-bit classical cord to the harbor of relativistic causality.
- [19] R. Srikanth, LANL eprint quant-ph/0103070.